

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN EARL CAMPBELL

No. C05-5434 MJJ (EDL)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER FOLLOWING DISCOVERY
HEARING AND PROTECTIVE ORDER**

v.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER
CORPORATION dba AMTRAK, JOE DEELY,
DOES 1 -15 inclusive,

Defendants.

On April 4, 2007, the Court held a telephonic discovery hearing with the parties regarding disputes arising during the deposition by Plaintiff of Steve Shelton. Pamela Price appeared by telephone on behalf of Plaintiff; Kathleen Maylin appeared by telephone on behalf of Defendants. For the reasons stated at the hearing, Defendants' privacy objection to Plaintiff's questions to Mr. Shelton regarding personnel decisions as to other employees is overruled, subject to the Court's ruling that access to personal identifying information (primarily names) of non-party employees is restricted to attorneys and the parties for the purposes of this litigation. The parties are ordered not to disclose any such identifying information to non-parties except if necessary in depositions of Defendants' employees, in which case the deponents must be informed of the protective order and told by Defendants to comply.

The parties shall meet and confer on the terms of a more detailed protective order to

1 supersede this one regarding the confidentiality of sensitive personal information about non-party
2 employees disclosed during discovery.¹ The parties shall further meet and confer promptly on the
3 related issues raised in Plaintiff's three pending discovery motions in light of the guidance given by
4 the Court during the discovery hearing and in this Order, seek a further protective order as
5 necessary, and inform the Court as soon as possible and no later than April 10, 2007, if any of those
6 issues are moot.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 Dated: April 4, 2007

Elizabeth D. Laporte

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ To the extent that Plaintiff's requests encompass apparently irrelevant personal information in personnel files, such as medical or detailed financial information, Plaintiff should narrow his request.